



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

in dispute between the two Churches; and notwithstanding the differences of opinion among the learned as to the meaning of particular passages, we think we may safely say that the authorized Protestant version of the Bible has not been *mistranslated* for the purpose of countenancing Protestantism and confuting Romanism. We shall have occasion hereafter to notice the controversy upon the Greek word *μετανοια* which is sometimes translated by the Roman Catholic translators, *repentance*, and sometimes *penance*, but always by Protestants *repentance*, and give our reasons for believing that the Protestant version is the correct one, but shall be happy to insert anything written with candour, and a competent knowledge of the subject by any Roman Catholic who will assert that the Protestant translators mistranslated these, or any other passages, for the fraudulent purpose we have referred to.

In the meantime we would invite our readers' attention to a remarkable attempt made by some theologians of the Roman Catholic Church to give Scriptural countenance to the leading doctrines of Romanism, and confute Protestantism out of the Bible.

The absence of any passage in the New Testament in which either *purgatory*, the *sacrifice of the mass*, the distinction between *latría* or supreme worship, and *dulia* or inferior worship, or the distinction between *mortal* or *venial* sins, was mentioned, was naturally strongly relied on by the Protestant Reformers in the 16th and 17th centuries. The French people, who were always more inquiring and free than their Italian and Spanish neighbours, could scarcely be successfully prevented from consulting the Scriptures for themselves; and a variety of translations into French had, from time to time, been published, the principal of which were those of Antwerp, in 1530, and reprinted in 1534, and that edited by Amelote, first published with notes in 1666, and afterwards without notes in 1686. All those translations and editions of the French Testament, though very imperfect, were however, felt on the whole, to be anything but favourable to the Roman Catholic party, in opposing the growth of Protestantism; and it, no doubt, was thought advisable to give to the French people a version in their vulgar tongue, which would correct this defect in all existing versions, and preserve the people from the taint of heresy. This important and remarkable book was published at Bordeaux, by Jacques Mongiron Millanges (the edition we have seen was printed in 1686), and we shall presently state under what authority.

First, however, let us give a few examples of its mode of translation, as contrasted with the Douay Testament published in Ireland, with the approval of all the Irish Roman Catholic bishops, in 1829, and the more modern translation of the Right Rev. F. P. Kenrick, Roman Catholic Bishop of Philadelphia, New York, 1851.

1 CORINTH, III., 15 (Douay version).—"If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire."

(Bishop Kenrick's version).—"If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved: yet as by fire."

Now for the Bordeaux Testament, p. 52 (1 Cor. iii. 15).—"Si l'œuvre de quelqu'un brûle, il en portera la perte, mais il sera sauvé quant à lui, ainsi toutefois comme par le feu du Purgatoire."

"If any one's work burn, he shall bear the loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet as by the fire of PURGATORY."

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES xiii. 2 (Douay version).—"And as they were ministering to the Lord, and fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them: Separate me Saul and Barnabas for the work whereunto I have taken them."

Bishop Kenrick.—"And as they were ministering to the Lord, and fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them: Separate me Saul and Barnabas for the work whereunto I have taken them."

What says the Bordeaux, p. 36?—Acts xiii. 2.—"Or comme ils offroient au Seigneur le sacrifice de la MESSE, et qu'ils jeunoient le S. Esprit leur dit; Separez moy Saul et Barnabé pour l'œuvre anquel je les ay destinez."

"And as they were offering to the Lord the *Sacrifice of the MASS*, and fasting," &c., &c.

How conclusive must such passages have been to the simple-minded readers of the French Testament, who sought in the Word of God a confutation of Protestant heresy, and proof from Holy Scripture of Purgatory and the Sacrifice of the Mass, being among the apostolical doctrines of primitive Christianity.

Not less so the following:—

1 Timothy iv. 1 (Bordeaux Testament, p. 192).—"Or l'esprit dit clairement, que derniers temps, quelquesuns se separeront de la foy Romaine s'adonnaux esprits d'erreur, et aux doctrines enseignées par des diables. V. 2.—Disans des choses fausses par hypocrisie, ayant aussi la conscience cauterisée. V. 3.—Condamnant le sacrement de mariage, l'abstinence des alimens que Dieu a créés pour les fidèles, &c."

"Now, the Spirit says clearly, that in the last times some shall separate themselves from the ROMAN FAITH,

giving themselves up to spirits of error and to doctrines taught by devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, and having their consciences seared; condemning the SACRAMENT of marriage, and abstinence from meats, which God has created," &c.

See now and compare the Douay version.—"Now the Spirit manifestly saith, that in the last times some shall depart from the faith, &c. . . . forbidding to marry, to abstain from meats," &c.

Bishop Kenrick follows the Douay version in this passage, but freely admits, in the note (see p. 463), that the passage ought to run *forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats*, as things unlawful; but in neither the Douay nor Bishop Kenrick's version is there a hint either as to the separation being from the Roman faith, or marriage being a sacrament, or that the apostasy of the latter times was to consist in condemning the sacrament, and not the practice of marriage.

Two other examples will suffice:—

1 John v. 17.—(Douay Testament).—"All iniquity is sin. And there is a sin unto death."

(Bishop Kenrick).—"Every iniquity is sin: and there is a sin unto death."

Bordeaux Testament, p. 292.—"Tout iniquité est péché, mais il y a quelque péché qui nest pas mortel, mais veniel."

"All iniquity is sin; but there is sin which is not mortal, but venial."

LUKE iv. 8.—(Douay version).—"And Jesus answering said to him, It is written: Thou shalt adore the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

(Bordeaux Testament).—"Serviras de latría a lui seul."

"And him only shalt thou serve with latría!"

What a convenient and conclusive mode of settling the controversy with heretics! For if this French Testament was published by sufficient authority, and certified to be a correct translation, what Frenchman could doubt that the alleged reformers had perverted and garbled the Holy Scriptures, by wickedly excluding from their copies and translations all mention of *purgatory*, the *sacrifice of the mass*, the *holy Roman faith*, the *sacrament of marriage*, *venial sin*, or the distinction between supreme and inferior worship,—the *Latría* and *Dulia* of the Church of Rome—all of which were thus distinctly and expressly mentioned in the authorized French version, though now we see them equally omitted from the most authentic of the Roman Catholic versions of the Holy Scriptures.

Let us now inquire by whom was this French translation made, and by what authority published and attested.

Let the volume speak for itself. We give the following translation, with the original French in the note. The title is as follows:—

"The New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, translated from Latin into French, by the Theologians of Louvain. Printed at Bordeaux, by James Mongiron Millanges, Printer to the King and the College, 1686, with approbation and permission."

Then follows the *approbation*, which is as follows:—

"We, the undersigned Doctors in Theology, of the University of Bordeaux, attest that the present French version of the Latin New Testament, revised and approved of by the Catholic Apostolic Church of Rome, made by the Doctors Theologians of the University of Louvain, revised and approved by several Doctors of Theology of the University of Paris, and several times printed by the permission of Superiors, is very useful for all those who shall be able to read it with the permission of their Superiors. In faith whereof we have signed this present attestation at Bordeaux, this 11th February, 1661.

"LOPES,  
Theological Canon of the Metropolitan Church  
"GERMAIN CARME."

Then is added the following

"PERMISSION.

"We, Louis D'Anglure de Bourlemont, by the Grace of God and of the Holy Apostolic See, Archbishop of Bordeaux, Primate of Aquitaine, permit the widow of James Mongiron Millanges to print the New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, translated from Latin into French, revised and exactly corrected. Given at Bordeaux, in our Archiepiscopal Palace, this 17th July, 1686.

"Louis, Archbishop of Bordeaux,  
"By order of his Grace,  
"Cosson, Secretary."

\* Le Nouveau Testament de notre Seigneur Jesus Christ, traduit de Latin en François par les Theologiens de Louvain. A Bordeaux chez Jacques Mongiron Millanges Imprimeur du Roy et du College, 1686, avec approbation et permission.

Nous soussignes Docteurs en Theologie de l'Université de Bordeaux attestons que la presente version Française du Nouveau Testament Latin reveu et approuvé de l'Eglise Catholique Apostolique et Romaine faite par les Docteurs Theologiens de l'Université de Louvain reveu et approuvé par plusieurs Docteurs du Theologie de l'Université de Paris et par la permission des Superieurs plusieurs fois imprimée est tresutile a tous ceux qui avec permission des Superieurs, serout capables de la lire. En foy dequoy avons signe la presente attestation. A Bordeaux ce 11 Fevrier, 1661.

LOPES,  
Chanoine Theologal de l'Eglise Metropolitaine,  
GERMAIN CARME.

PERMISSION.  
Louis D'Anglure de Bourlemont, par la Grace de Dieu et du Saint

Here, then, we have the three Roman Catholic universities of Louvain, Paris, and Bordeaux, and the Archbishop of the latter city, and Primate of Aquitaine, attesting and approving of this translation, as carefully revised and exactly correct! What higher authority could any pious Frenchman desire, and who could dream of or suspect the *pious frauds* by which such daring interpolations could alone have been introduced or excused?

Père Simon, in his "Critical History of the Versions of the New Testament," gives us an amusing anecdote of Monsieur Veron, the controversialist, who, being asked why he translated the passage Acts xiii. 2, "*the sacrifice of the Mass*," naively replied by giving the reason—"Que les Calvinistes lui avoient souvent demandé en quel lieu de l'Ecriture il étoit marqué que les Apôtres eussent dit la Messe!"—"That the Calvinists had often asked him in what part of Scripture it was stated that the apostles had ever said Mass!" To get out of which difficulty, we presume, controversy had taught him no readier or simpler means, than that of manufacturing a translation for the purpose, and fortified by no less than the theologians of three great universities, and a Primate Archbishop, we can scarcely be surprised if the expedient was for a time a successful one.

After this, will it be boasted that the Roman Catholic Church have been the only faithful preservers and guardians of the Divine oracles? and do we act uncharitably when we warn our readers against guides so unscrupulous? We do not assert that all Roman Catholic bishops are capable of such barefaced dishonesty; but we do say to our readers, as a man loves his own soul, let him take care how he implicitly, and without inquiry, trusts a Church that will tolerate universities and archbishops who, by way of *pious fraud*, dare to falsify the Word of God at this rate. Any man may honestly make a mistake in translating or transcribing a will; but who would trust one who could deliberately add to or forge testaments or deeds? Surely it is not piety, but wickedness, to corrupt the holy oracles of God, to *serve a turn*. After this, we think no one need be much surprised at the interpolations and forgeries which have been circulated under high authority among the writings of the Fathers, and the epistles of the Popes, much less at the perversions, by modern controversialists, of passages from such writers as Bishop Jeremy Taylor and Sir Edward Sandys—which we have already noticed more than once in our pages—and which we feel assured no Roman Catholic, of education or principle, would willingly countenance, whatever the object aimed at by such fraud, be it pious or otherwise.

#### THE TALK OF THE ROAD—No. X.

WELL, the work began to get a little slack in Kilcommon, so Pat went home for a few days, and, of course, he went over the first evening to Jemmy Brandan, to have a talk with him about what was doing.

"So tell us, Pat," said Jem, "how things is going on."

"Why, then, there's law going on," said Pat.

"And what's that about?" said Jem.

"Why, it's about stoning the readers," said Pat. "I was out one day with the cart, and I saw the greatest work at all; there was the readers first, walking as hard as they could, and you wouldn't see a bit of the colour of their clothes as big as my hand, the way they were covered over with mud and slush from head to foot; and Paddy Brady, and Mick Dooly, and the Finnegans, and a set of the biggest vagabonds in Kilcommon, the fellows that used to be stealing the sheep, and that's up to all kinds of mischief, after them, pelting all the dirt they could get on them; and when the readers crossed over a piece of road that the stones was spread on the day before, and the boys came on it after them, if there wasn't a shower of stones after them fit to wipe the mud off of them! And their hats was knocked off, and their heads cut, and lumps on them as big as eggs. And then the polis comes down, and takes Paddy Brady, and Mick Dooly, and another that was foremost, and marches them off. And sure, says the boys, 'it's only defendin' our religion we are.'"

"And arn't they the pretty fellows to be defendin' their religion?" said Jem.

"Sure enough," said Pat, "I believe it's little they trouble the priest about religion. I hear tell there's not one of them has been at confession these five years; but Father John thinks them the right sort now, as you'll find."

"Well, on the Friday after, the boys were to be tried afore the bench, and it happened to be a holiday, so there was no work doing; and I seen such a crowd going to the chapel that I went there, too, to hear what Father John would say; and, sure enough, after mass, the sermon was all about the firebrands, and the souters, and the ranters, and the poor, innocent boys

Siege Apostolique Archeveque de Bordeaux, Primate d'Aquitaine nous permettons a la Veuve de G. de la Court Jacques Mongiron Millanges de faire imprimer le N. T. de N. S. J. C. traduit de Latin en François reveu et exactement corrigé. Donné a Bordeaux dans notre Palais Archiepiscopal, le 17 Juillet, 1686.

LOUIS, Arch. de Bordeaux,  
par commandement, de Monsignor  
Cosson, Secrétaire.

\* Bishop Kenrick explains this passage in a note, p. 253—"As a man escaping through the fire." See also CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. I., p. 45, for St. Chrysostom's opinion on this passage.

that was going to be tried, and persecuted, and exterminated, only just for trying to keep their religion from being insulted by the firebrands. So when he was tired, says he, 'Now go down every one of you,' says he, 'man, woman, and child,' says he, 'and stand by the poor fellows that's going to be persecuted and swore against by the firebrands, says he. So, sure enough, when I got to the courthouse, there was a thousand people there anyway. And there was Mr. Foley, the lawyer, from Dublin, come down to defend the boys.'

"And who paid for him coming?" said Jem.

"Why," said Pat, "Father John sent round his servant, and two or three of his head men, to all the Catholic shopkeepers and tradesmen in Kilcommon, and made them all subscribe their pounds, and ten shillings, and five shillings; and I heard tell they liked it little enough, but they were mostly all afraid to bring Father John's tongue on them in the chapel; only Mr. Nulty and one or two more that never cares what Father John can say. Well, the readers told their story mighty fair and clever, and then Mr. Foley got up and examined them, to make them confess they were insulting the people, and he fetched out a tract, and asked them did they give any of that; and they said they did a few; and then he read out a place where it said the priests was harrassing the people for their dues. And then he made a great speech entirely to the magistrates, and said, what wonder what would happen to them, when they were insulting the people and their religion like that?"

"And did he make out they were insulting their religion any other way?" said Jem.

"No then he didn't," said Pat, "but he thought that the greatest insult at all."

"Well, then, I'm thinking," said Jem, "he got his story from Father John, for it's he that would think that the greatest insult entirely. But sure the people of Kilcommon is greatly changed this ten years back, if they think the like of that is an insult to them. Don't I remember, just ten years ago, when the people was fairly riz for the Priest's Tariff, as they called it, up the country? And wasn't the boys of Kilcommon just going to rise for it too, and had it all settled among them, and the day fixed, and all the boys bound to pay only the dues allowed in the Tariff for christening, and marriages, and everything else? And didn't Father John and the rest get up a great meeting for Repale, to put the boys off it, and promised to get them the country for themselves, and all kinds of things? And hadn't they fifty priests at it? And wasn't that the way the monster meetings for the Repale come about, where all the boys was expecting to get the word at last to take Ireland for themselves? And a mighty cute and clever job it was of Father John and the rest, for it put the people off the Tariff entirely.\* But sure the people of Kilcommon is greatly changed if they are so easy hurt at a word agen the dues. But if Father John taught the lawyer his story, sure it's all plain enough."

"Well, that was all the insult they had, any way," said Pat, "and then Mr. Owens got up, and said there was only a dozen of that tract given out, and that he stopped it when he heard Father John took offence, and never gave any more; and if anything else was insulting, he'll stop it too. And when the lawyer was done, the gentlemen said there was no law for stoning people for the like of that, and they would have to find the boys guilty, just as if they stoned anybody else. So then the lawyer asked the gentleman only to put a fine on the boys, and whatever it was it would be paid. And while I was wondering where the like of them would get the money, I turned round, and saw Father John with his roll of bank notes out in his hand."

"Ay," said Jem, "I seen that myself, after the work at the election last summer, when Father John paid down the money in open court for every one of the boys that was fined for the work—and bad work it was.† But did the magistrates let them off with a fine?"

"Deed, didn't they," said Pat, "this time. Old Mr. Everards says, just as quiet and easy as you please—'It's a month's imprisonment and labour we're going to give them,' says he. And I never seen Father John look so mad, for he was'n't going to stand that for the boys. Still it's a pretty good thing they made of it; for all their wives and children got new clothes, and meal, and money, and what not."

"And isn't that the decent way for Father John to be defending his religion?" said Jem; "didn't the Rev. Mr. Owens write him a letter, asking him to settle who was right, by fair discussion, before the people? But Father John would rather get his religion defended with stones and mud, by the blackguards that never comes to confession at all: and doesn't all that show who knows that he has fair reason on his side?"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "I am coming to think more and more that the priests hasn't reason on their side, and that they know, that once it comes to fair argument,

the people will find out that. But as I was going home I fell in with Mr. Owens, and had a talk with him. And, says he, 'Why wouldn't we be stoned,' says he. 'When the blessed Apostles was stoned in almost every place they went to preach in?' says he, and with that he pulled out his Bible, and showed me two places where the Apostles was stoned for speaking to the people; and another place where the Jews gathered up all the wicked men of the vulgar sort, and made a tumult, and set the city on an uproar,† just for all the world the way Father John does now, 'and so it's no new thing,' says he, 'but we must follow the way the Blessed Apostles went.'"

"But, your reverence," says I, "what can poor men, like the likes of us, do, when the priest can get up the like of that again any of us, and maybe put us out of our work too? How can we stand up for the Bible at all? And with that he took out his Bible again (and it was a Douay Bible too), and he read these words, that came harder on me than any words that ever I read in the Bible; and Pat took out his Douay Bible and read the place (Mark viii. 38)—'For he that shall be ashamed of me and of my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of Man also will be ashamed of him, when he shall come in the glory of the Father, with the Holy Angels.' 'And now,' says he, 'are you ashamed to stand up for the word of the Son of God, and will you make him be ashamed to stand up for you?' So I couldn't tell what to say at all, and I can't get them words out of my mind; and what will I do at all?"

So if ever we hear of what they did, we will tell it to our readers.

#### LATRIA, HYPERDULIA, DULIA.

A pious clergyman of the Established Church, in the west of Ireland, once showed us a scapular that had been presented to him by one of his parishioners who had seceded from the Church of Rome and joined his congregation, on which were embossed, in rude embroidery, three figures, representing, as he stated, Joseph, Jesus, and Mary, on a small heart of cloth, which, for seven years, the individual in question had worn round his neck as a charm, and worshipped, under the impression that Joseph, Jesus, and Mary were the holy and ever-blessed Trinity. We cannot take upon us to state from what source he obtained this scapular, whether from his parish priest or some itinerant Jesuit, who traded on his simplicity; nor should we think it needful to notice such cases of ignorance and superstition, if we did not believe that thousands of such cases exist in our unfortunate country, and that no exertion is made, on the part of either the Roman Catholic priesthood or hierarchy, to disabuse the minds of the people from such delusions. While examining the subject of indulgences, which we can assure our readers we have not lost sight of, with a view to bringing forward some instances which might practically illustrate that important subject, and enable us hereafter to make the arguments of our opponents and ourselves the better understood by those seriously desirous of arriving at the truth, we were struck by the following specimen, which we conceive to be not wholly unconnected with this subject, and which we take from a volume already referred to in our pages, entitled "Indulgences granted by Sovereign Pontiffs to the Faithful, &c., collected by a Member of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences in Rome, translated with permission of Superiors," published by Richard Grace and Son, 45, Capel-street, Dublin, p. 136. It is verbatim as follows:—

#### "Seventy-fifth Indulgence."

"In order to increase among Christian people a true devotion towards Jesus and Mary, by frequently invoking their most sacred names, together with that of St. Joseph, and to encourage the faithful to recommend themselves to their protection at the close of life, on which depends eternity, Pius VII., by a Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, dated 28th of April, 1807, granted for ever an indulgence of 300 days each time they repeat devoutly, and with contrite heart, the following three aspirations to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, and whenever they say one of these devout aspirations, he granted them an indulgence of 100 days. In both cases the indulgence is applicable to the souls of the faithful departed. It is recommended to make these short and pious aspirations of the soul in the day, and frequently during life, and to suggest them to sick persons in danger of death, which will afford them much spiritual comfort:—

"Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, I offer you my heart and soul.

"Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, assist me in my last agony.

"Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, may I breathe forth my soul in peace with you."

We are aware that, according to Roman Catholic principles, supreme worship, by them called Latria, is

due to our Lord Jesus Christ, as one of the persons of the ever Blessed Trinity. A secondary and inferior worship—Hyperdulia—to the Blessed Virgin Mary, and a tertiary or lower worship—Dulia—to Joseph and other saints canonized by the Church. To keep ever in mind this important distinction is admitted to be necessary to avoid the mortal sin of idolatry; but here we have Pope Pius VII. recommending an act, including *Latria*, *Dulia*, and *Hyperdulia* in the same prayers, and even in the same sentence, solemnly recommending pious persons, in the hour of death, devoutly to offer up their *heart and soul*, not to the three persons of the ever Blessed Trinity—God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, each of whom is entitled to the same supreme worship—but to three persons, of whom, according to Roman Catholic doctrine, one only is entitled to supreme, and the others to different degrees of even inferior worship.

Will any of our Roman Catholic readers explain to us how it would be possible to offer up our *heart and soul* to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph in three different ways, in the same devout aspiration, or tell us in what respect calling on Jesus, Mary, and Joseph at the hour of death to "assist us in our last agony," differs from the most solemn prayer which the human heart is capable of pouring forth to the Most High God? It would strike an ordinary mind, unclouded by metaphysical and scholastic theology, that it would be mockery to address to the Divine Redeemer of our souls in the solemn hour of death, anything short of the highest adoration—the supreme worship of which the human soul is capable, and that no language addressed to the Supreme Being could surpass in devout solemnity the simple and touching words—"I offer thee my heart and soul—assist me in my last agony—may I breathe forth my soul in peace with thee!" If such be not the prayer of *Latria*, we would earnestly request some of our friends to show us in what the worship of *Latria* consists. If it do amount to *Latria*, or an act of the highest devotion, we would then ask whether it be probable—nay, possible—that a dying man could use these prayers at the same moment, with three different feelings and emotions—*Latria* towards Jesus, *Hyperdulia* towards Mary, *Dulia* towards Joseph? Can one offer up his *heart and soul* in three different ways, in the same breath, to three different persons, differing so widely in dignity and nature? In sober sadness, we ask our Roman Catholic friends to tell us whether the blame lies at the door of the ignorant peasant who worships the worsted images of Joseph, Jesus, and Mary, and the itinerants who traffic in such wares, or at the door of Pope Pius VII., who offers, in the nineteenth century, 300 days' indulgence to every one who prays to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph in the way prescribed, and recommends them frequently, every day during their lives, and especially when dying, to look for spiritual comfort from such exercises?

We have looked into Cardinal Bellarmine on this subject, who distinctly lays it down (*De Sanct. Beatit. Lib. i. c. 17. p. 292*—"Quomodo sancti invocandi non sint") that it is proved—1st, by Scripture; 2nd, by the practice of the Church; 3rd, by reason; and 4th, by the Fathers St. Augustine and Theodoret, that we should not expect or seek for anything from saints save that they should, by their prayers, obtain from God those things which are useful for us, which he tells us (in chapter xii., p. 287) is the inferior worship of *Dulia*, as distinguished from *Latria* or the worship of God, and *Hyperdulia*, the worship of Christ in his *human nature*, and the Blessed Virgin as the Mother of the Son of God. Now, is there anything in these prescribed prayers (to be rewarded by a 300 days' indulgence) or in the exhortation to use them to guard the suppliant against the danger of confounding the divine and human natures of Christ, and addressing him only in his *human nature* with *Hyperdulia*, or of falling into idolatry, by addressing the Blessed Virgin and St. Joseph with *Latria*, at the same moment with Jesus in his *divine nature*?

Did Pope Pius VII. recommend the dying to resort to Jesus in his *Divine* or in his *human nature*, to address him with *Latria* or mere *Hyperdulia*?

Could any man, however educated in scholastic subtleties, much less any simple-minded rustic, suppose that by the words, "Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, I offer you my heart and soul," it is not meant to convey a *devoting* of the heart and soul to each of those three persons, but merely, "Jesus, I devote to thee my heart and soul; and, Mary, I beseech thee to intercede for me with thy son Jesus, to accept my heart and soul; and Joseph, I invoke thee to pray for me?"

If we consult the written Word of God, we shall be at no loss to point out to whom we ought to offer our heart and soul, as the highest act of religious homage.

"These are the precepts," says Moses, "which the Lord your God commanded that I should teach you. Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole strength." And when our blessed Lord himself was asked by a certain lawyer tempting him—"Master, what must I do to possess eternal life?" The answer was, "What is written in the law? How readest

\* Jem is quite right about this fact. We know it ourselves on good authority. The Priest's Tariff had at that time been proclaimed in many counties in Ireland, when the monster meetings turned the minds of the people in another direction.

† Jem is quite correct about this fact, too.

\* Acts xiv. 5 and 19.

† Acts xvii. 5.

\* Deut. vi., Douay Bible.